

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

PAVON EMILIO,)	4:13CV3088
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
ROBERT P. HOUSTON, Director,)	
FRED BRITTEN, Warden, and L.)	
ANTHOLZ, Officer,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On August 16, 2013, the court entered an order that, among other things, directed Plaintiff to serve summons on Defendants no later than December 13, 2013. (Filing No. [16](#).) The court extended the time in which Plaintiff had to serve Defendants on December 9, 2013, January 22, 2014, and March 12, 2014. (Filing No. [18](#), Filing No. [20](#), and Filing No. [28](#).) While Plaintiff has served Defendants Fred Britten and Robert Houston, he has not served Defendant L. Antholz.

Plaintiff shall have 21 days to show cause why his claims against Defendant L. Antholz should not be dismissed due to Plaintiff's failure to serve him with summons.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff shall have 21 days from the date of this Memorandum and Order to show cause why his claims against Defendant L. Antholz should not be dismissed.

2. If Plaintiff does not respond, or if good cause is not shown, his claims against L. Antholz will be dismissed and this matter will proceed only as to Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Robert Houston and Fred Britten.

3. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline with the following text: July 1, 2014: deadline for Plaintiff to show cause.

DATED this 12th day of June, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ John M. Gerrard
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.